

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
DATED SEPTEMBER 22, 2005

Appln. No. 09/490,268

- 7 -

November 9, 2005

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2005. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Summary of Claim Rejections

Claims 33-39 and 60 are pending in the application. Claims 33-35 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,570,554 to Searer. Claims 36, 37 and 60 are rejected as obvious over Searer. Claims 38 and 39 are rejected as obvious over Searer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,834 to Martensson et al. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Summary of Claim Objections

Claim 36 is objected to because it depends upon a canceled claim.

Summary of Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner and her Supervisor for the interview granted on the November 8, 2005. Claims 33, 60 and 37 were discussed at the interview along with U.S. Patent No. 5,570,554 to Searer.

Applicant agreed to cancel Claim 37 and present new Claim 62 in independent form as a combination claim to overcome the rejection as to indefiniteness.

Applicant also presented arguments traversing the rejection of Claim 33 as anticipated by Searer. Applicant argued that Searer did not support the rejection because, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the first flange (40) does not engage the rear leg (18) and the second flange (40) does not remain in spaced apart relation from the front leg (32) as recited in Claim 33. In support of his arguments,

Interview record  
OK 12/9/05  
n.a.  
DPS